

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-47, 49, and 50 are currently pending, with Claims 3-13 and 16-47 withdrawn as directed to non-elected inventions. Claims 1, 2, and 14 have been amended; Claim 48 has been canceled without prejudice; and Claims 49 and 50 have been added by the present amendment. The changes and additions to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner agreed to re-examine previously withdrawn Claims 14 and 15; Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite regarding the MPEG-4 coding and compression protocols; and Claims 1, 2, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,990,955 to Koz (hereinafter "the '955 patent").

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is rendered moot by the present cancellation of that claim.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a moving image coding apparatus, comprising: (1) coding means for dividing an input moving image signal into a plurality of frame image signals, dividing each of the frame image signals into a plurality of area image signals, compression coding each area image signal into an area image code string, and adding frame header information indicating a compression coding mode of the frame to each area image code string; and (2) packetization means for collecting a plurality of area image code strings to which the frame header information has been added, and for adding packet header information to the collected plurality of area image code strings. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a plurality of area image signals and a plurality of area image code strings, instead of

one or more area image signals and one or more area image code strings. The changes to Claim 1 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

The '955 patent is directed to a dual encoding/compression method and system for picture quality data density enhancement. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '955 patent fails to disclose coding means for dividing each of the frame image signals into a plurality of area image signals, and packetization means for collecting a plurality of area image code strings to which the frame header information has been added, and for adding packet header information to the collected plurality of area image code strings, as recited in amended Claim 1. Further, Applicants note that the outstanding Office Action indicates that "if the alternative language of 'one or more' is changed to 'a plurality of' then this would overcome the outstanding rejection or record."¹ Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 (and dependent Claim 2) is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 14 recites limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 1. Moreover, Claim 14 has been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 14 (and dependent Claim 15) is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 14.

The present amendment also sets forth new Claims 49 and 50 for examination on the merits. New Claims 49 and 50 recited limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claims 1 and 2, but are written in non-means-plus-function format. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. Moreover, based on the asserted allowability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 49 and 50 patentably define over the '955 patent.

¹ Office Action dated December 15, 2004, page 3.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 14, 49, and 50 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over the '955 patent.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Kurt M. Berger

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870
Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
KMB/rac

I:\ATTY\KMB\0039\7606\00397606US-AM.DOC